1 2 3 4 5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE 7 8 CHRIS TEMPLETON, NO. 2:20-cv-01578-MJP 9 Plaintiff. DEFENDANT'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF 10 v. MOTION TO QUASH DEPOSITION SUBPOENA AND SUBPOENA FOR 11 THE BISHOP OF CHARLESTON, a PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS Corporation Sole, 12 **Noted for Consideration:** Defendant. October 30, 2020 13 14 Defendant submits this reply in support of its Motion to Quash the subpoena for 15 deposition testimony and production of documents that was served on Fr. Tim Watters. As 16 before, Fr. Watters has no information regarding Templeton's claims, nor any information 17 regarding the accused priest, Fr. Raymond DuMouchel. Likewise, Fr. Watters has no 18 information regarding the priest of the Diocese of Savannah, Georgia, Wayland Yoder Brown. 19 Fr. Watters has no documents that are responsive to the subpoena. (See Declaration of Fr. Tim 20 Watters.) In short, Fr. Watters will not be able to testify regarding any fact that is relevant to 21 DEFENDANTS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION CHRISTIE LAW GROUP, PLLC TO QUASH DEPOSITION SUBPOENA AND 2100 Westlake Avenue N., Suite 206 SUBPOENA FOR PRODUCTION OF SEATTLE, WA 98109

206-957-9669

DOCUMENTS - 1

(Case No. 2:20-cv-01578-MJP)

Templeton's claims or allegations that he was molested by Fr. Raymond DuMouchel – who died
in 2006. Rather, as Templeton's brief crystallizes – counsel desires to question Fr. Watters about
alleged internal non-public discussions that may have occurred in the early 1980s between the
Bishop (who himself died in 1993) <sup>1</sup> and the Judicial Vicar of the Diocese and a member of the
Bishop's curia.

The Diocese has not waived the First Amendment protections afforded to the internal deliberative process of the Bishop and his advisors.<sup>2</sup> As the Fourth Circuit held in *Rayburn v. Gen. Conf. of Seventh-Day Adventists*<sup>3</sup>, the Establishment Clause insulates matters of church administration and government from interference and manipulation by civil courts – and this includes the discovery process.<sup>4</sup> The First Amendment bars civil courts from becoming entangled with religion by "probing the mind of the church." Thus Fr. Watters' consultations with his Bishop on matters that were important to the Church are not properly the subject of discovery.

The Supreme Court has repeatedly granted religious organizations broad protections

15

18

19

20

21

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

DEFENDANTS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO QUASH DEPOSITION SUBPOENA AND SUBPOENA FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS - 2 (Case No. 2:20-cv-01578-MJP)

CHRISTIE LAW GROUP, PLLC 2100 WESTLAKE AVENUE N., SUITE 206 SEATTLE, WA 98109 206-957-9669

 <sup>16</sup> It should be noted that the late-Bishop Ernest Unterkoeffler was initially named as a defendant "in his official capacity." The District Court dismissed him on the Diocese's Rule 12(b)(6) motion.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Templeton's reliance on Pope Francis' 2019 decree *Vos Estis Lux Mundi* as constituting a blanket waiver of First Amendment freedoms and assertions of privilege is woefully misplaced, and that is not what the document says at all. Nevertheless, civil courts may not entangle themselves in Church affairs by imposing their own interpretation to canonical documents.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Rayburn, 772 F.2d 1164 (4th Cir. 1985). See also Hosanna-Tabor Evangelical Lutheran Church & Sch. v. EEOC, 565 U.S. 171 (2012); EEOC v. Catholic Univ. of Amer., 83 F.3d 455 (D.C.Cir. 1996); Phillips v. Marist Soc'y, 80 F.3d 274 (8th Cir. 1996)(First Amendment prohibits secular courts from interpreting canon law and intruding on ecclesiastical affairs).

against government infringement of their religious liberties and prohibiting coercive government entanglement in matters of ecclesiastical governance.<sup>5</sup> Among these inviolable liberties are the right of an organization to control its governance and administration.<sup>6</sup> Internal church deliberations and decision-making – including the deliberations of a bishop and his advisors – are protected under the First Amendment.<sup>7</sup> The very process of inquiry into the internal deliberations of a church violates the Constitution.<sup>8</sup>

Additionally, Fr. Watters is a canon lawyer – he has advanced degrees in canon law and holds a *Juris Cononici Licentiate*. Any canon lawyer must have completed the degree program and curriculum determined by the Vatican (a sovereign nation) at an institution approved by the Vatican. The Tribunal over which the Judicial Vicar presides is the ecclesiastical court of the Diocese and provides canonical legal advice to the Bishop. The Judicial Vicar oversees matters of ecclesiastical discipline and advises the Bishop on disciplinary matters. The Catholic canon law system is the oldest functioning legal system in the Western World dating back centuries. Both the common law tradition of attorney-client privilege and South Carolina Code § 19-11-90 afford protection for communications such as those between deceased Bishop Unterkoefler and his Judicial Vicar, Fr. Watters.

17

18

21

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

DEFENDANTS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO QUASH DEPOSITION SUBPOENA AND SUBPOENA FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS - 3 (Case No. 2:20-cv-01578-MJP)

CHRISTIE LAW GROUP, PLLC 2100 WESTLAKE AVENUE N., SUITE 206 SEATTLE, WA 98109 206-957-9669

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> See Watson v. Jones, 13 Wall. 670, 727 (1872); Serbian Eastern Orthodox Diocese v. Milivojevich, 426 U.S. 696 (1976); Kedroff v. St. Nicholas Cathedral of Russian Orthodox Church in N. Am., 344 U.S. 94, 119 (1952).

 <sup>6</sup> Serbian Eastern Orthodox Diocese 426 U.S. at 698, 721; Hosanna-Tabor, 565 U.S. at 171.
 See also Cannata v. Catholic Diocese of Austin 700 F.3d 169, 172 (5th Cir. 2012)(Church autonomy protects the ability of religious organizations to govern themselves free from state interference).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> See e.g. Bryce v. Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Colo., 289 F.3d 648, 658 (10th Cir. 2002). <sup>8</sup> Little v. Wuerl, 929 F.2d 944, 949 (3d Cir. 1991)

## Case 2:20-cv-01578-MJP Document 6 Filed 10/30/20 Page 4 of 6

1	Bishops frequently rely on their Judicial Vicars for advice on canonical and ecclesiastical
2	matters. The Judicial Vicar is also tasked with keeping abreast of developments in canon law
3	and advising the Bishop on matters of church government. Additionally, the <i>curia</i> on which Fr.
4	Watters sat, is the circle of close advisors to the Bishop on matters affecting governance and
5	operations of the Diocese on a broad spectrum of matters that are important to the Church.
6	Unaddressed by Templeton's brief is the fact that Fr. Watters is subject to a very broad
7	agreement of confidentiality. The agreement likely will preclude testimony by him regarding the
8	information sought by the plaintiff.
9	For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff Templeton's subpoena for deposition testimony and
10	production of documents should be quashed, and Plaintiff should be prohibited from obtaining
11	any such testimony.
12	DATED this 30 <sup>th</sup> day of October, 2020.
13	CHRISTIE LAW GROUP, PLLC
14	By/s/Robert L. Christie
15	ROBERT L. CHRISTIE, WSBA #10895 2100 Westlake Avenue N., Suite 206
16	Seattle, WA 98109 Phone: 206-957-9669
17	Email: bob@christielawgroup.com Attorney for Defendant
18	
19	
20	
21	

DEFENDANTS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO QUASH DEPOSITION SUBPOENA AND SUBPOENA FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS - 4 (Case No. 2:20-cv-01578-MJP)

1

21

CHRISTIE LAW GROUP, PLLC 2100 Westlake Avenue N., Suite 206 SEATTLE, WA 98109 206-957-9669

## Case 2:20-cv-01578-MJP Document 6 Filed 10/30/20 Page 5 of 6

1	TURNER PADGET GRAHAM & LANEY P.A.
2	By <u>/s/ Richard S. Dukes, Jr.</u> Richard S. Dukes, Jr., (pending pro hac vice)
3	40 Calhoun Street, Suite 200 (29401) P.O. Box 22129
4	Charleston, South Carolina 29413 Telephone: (843) 576-2810
5	Facsimile: (843) 577-1646 Email: <u>rdukes@turnerpadet.com</u>
6	Attorney for Defendant
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	

DEFENDANTS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO QUASH DEPOSITION SUBPOENA AND SUBPOENA FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS - 5 (Case No. 2:20-cv-01578-MJP)

CHRISTIE LAW GROUP, PLLC 2100 WESTLAKE AVENUE N., SUITE 206 SEATTLE, WA 98109 206-957-9669

## 1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE** I hereby certify that on the 30<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2020, I electronically filed the foregoing 2 with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system when will send notification of such filing to the following: 3 J.D. Smith, WSBA #28246 4 LAW OFFICE OF J.D. SMITH, PLLC 8015 SE 28th St., Suite 212 5 Mercer Island, WA 98040 Phone: 206-588-8529 6 Fax: 206-588-8531 Email: JD@JDSmithLaw.com 7 Attorney for Plaintiff 8 I hereby certify that on the 30th day of October, I sent via electronic mail the foregoing document to the following non CM/ECF participants: Mark A. Tate 10 TATE LAW GROUP, LLC 25 Bull Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor 11 Savannah, GA 31401 Phone: 234-3030 12 Email: marktate@tatelawgroup.com Attorney for Plaintiff 13 Charles Henshaw, Jr. 14 **FURR & HENSHAW** 1900 N. Oak Street 15 Myrtle Beach, SC 29578 Phone: 843-626-7621 16 Email: Charles.henshaw@fholaw.com Attorney for Plaintiff 17 CHRISTIE LAW GROUP, PLLC 18 By \_\_\_\_\_/s/Robert L. Christie 19 ROBERT L. CHRISTIE, WSBA #10895 2100 Westlake Avenue N., Suite 206 20 Seattle, WA 98109 Phone: 206-957-9669 21 Email: bob@christielawgroup.com DEFENDANTS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION CHRISTIE LAW GROUP, PLLC TO QUASH DEPOSITION SUBPOENA AND 2100 Westlake Avenue N., Suite 206 SUBPOENA FOR PRODUCTION OF SEATTLE, WA 98109 DOCUMENTS - 6 206-957-9669

(Case No. 2:20-cv-01578-MJP)